

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 5:51 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Introduction Comments

From: Larry Gross

Subject: Introduction Comments

Message Body:

1.1

Might consider including simplified layman's language - i.e. "The Federal (and State) government encourage regional approaches to utilizing tax dollars for transportation infrastructure".

Consider explaining PD-16 and it's mission and how jurisdictions get added to the MPO.

Consider explaining how the Policy Committee is appointed by local jurisdictions.

Might consider listing the MPOs in Va and their jurisdictions and explaining that they all operate similarly to FAMPO.

Might mention VAMPO.

not sure if this is covered later but explain why the CLRP is "constrained" and how that affects what goes on the CLRP and what gets put on unfunded "needs" list.

1.2

regional performance measures - GOOD!

page 3: "scenarios".. what are they - conceptually? Can an example be given?

...have to set snooze alarm for some of this stuff... ;-)

page 4 - "maintain CLRP" - maintain AND UPDATE on a cycle

explain precisely what Financially Constrained means - at the top and not buried in paragraphs...

explain why the "constrained" has such a big impact on what we build - and what we can't build even if we say it is 'needed".

Map 1 - PD 16 in the context of MPO. DID the PD concept get explained earlier? why a PD map with the MPO also on it?

would like to see a graphic that shows the CLRP and the "needs" clouds and a "flow" connection between them showing how "needs" projects "advance" over the funding / LRTP cycles.

Intro is in need of simpering sound-bite type laymans explanations in front of the deeper context discussions.

People should be able to quickly "scan" the doc to get the essence of what the MPO and the LRTP do... with the option of reading deeper if they want but not having to read deep to get the gist of it.

On the VTRANS investment priorities - can we show which ones likely involve FAMPO in the coming years?

but it's an excellent Table!

SYIP - is there some way to explain how FAMPOs LRTP is related to the State Plan without getting wrapped around the axle?

end of comments for Intro.....

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 7:11 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 2: THE GEORGE WASHINGTON REGION TODAY

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 2: THE GEORGE WASHINGTON REGION TODAY

Message Body:
2.1 THE REGION DEFINED

discussion of increased growth but not why. I think it's important to note the reason why because the KIND of transportation infrastructure we need is more oriented to commuting than regional growth like we see for urbanized areas like NoVa.

re: "threatening natural and cultural"

for some reason that kind of phrasing sounds like growth is a bad thing... and it's not unless we fail to protect the things we do value - as we do grow.

re: UDA - is dead... in both Stafford and Spotsy. Consider converting the nomenclature to "targeted growth areas" or similar.

the statement " UDAs will help steer away from Sprawl" is over the edge.

People move here to commute to NoVa because we provide affordable SFD in conventional subdivisions that are no longer affordable in the NoVa area.

People are not going to commute 50 miles to live in the same kind of settlement pattern they could live in much closer to NoVa.

They're moving here to live in single family homes in subdivisions and no matter how many UDAs we designate, it won't change that demand.

we need to confront the reality of this in our planning documents and not be advocates of wishing/hoping/advocating for dense development to replace conventional subdivisions because unless a way is found to keep land from being rezoned to subdivisions - we are living in denial on this.

Better, in my view, to accept the fact that we are going to build MORE subdivisions and to focus on the reality that we are a commuter-centric region that needs commuter infrastructure rather than denying we are and/or sounding like we are advocating for changes in land-use to "stop the sprawl".

2.3 REGIONAL ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND FUNDING

is the survey referenced and available to review in the LRTP?

re: "
As described in the introduction, one of the major findings of the 2035 LRTP was that the Region is receiving an inadequate amount of transportation funding to deal

with the rapidly growing Region"

this implies that the money for our regions needs - is coming from somewhere else instead of here.

I think this perpetuates a fundamental misunderstanding of how transportation is funded - and generally speaking - each region is not going to receive more funding from other regions but our discussions imply that additional funding needs to come from "somewhere else".

I think it's important for people to understand that funding is not likely to come from other places but from here and we can choose how we pay but we are going to be the source of new funding not NOVA or Hampton or Richmond or Kentucky.

the survey clearly shows that people consider commuting infrastructure as important.

2.4.4 Survey Findings and Recommendations

need to be careful about telling us what others "want" especially when it comes to things like natural/cultural resources and land use.

I worry that the MPO might be perceived as too involved in trying to "save" land and/or trying to change attitudes about land use and development.

I'd prefer to see the MPO in the role of "telling it like it is" for transportation and to better accept the idea that we are likely to continue to grow because of our "affordable" subdivisions for NoVa commuters and as such - we need to focus on commuting infrastructure and issues.

I think I'd steer away from saying what people want" in terms of land-use especially when it runs counter to our development patterns to date.

2.5 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

same comment as earlier - if you really want people to read this - you have to develop shorter more layman-friendly narratives on the front then if they want to get deeper they can but truthfully speaking - very few people are going to wade through this unless you first set it up in more simple terms.

more pictures, more graphics, more examples of how these goals relate to every day perspectives.

remember you're writing this for average Joes not some policy wonk in FHWA.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 3: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 3: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

Message Body:
CHAPTER 3: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

not a word here about commuting and commuters and what percent of the jobs are not here but commuted to and what percent of our growth is due to commuters who live here and commute to jobs elsewhere.

shouldn't we provide that perspective ?

how about TWO top 10 employers charts?

one that shows only LOCAL employment

and the other that shows external employment?

we need to show the reality of our current demographics and acknowledge the likely future trends that commuting will likely continue - and whether the rate will stay the same, increase or decrease and why.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 5:51 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 4: CONNECTING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 4: CONNECTING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

Message Body:
Preface:

Don't take anything I am saying here as unbridled criticism of all the fine efforts that the staff at FAMPO has put into this important document.

Some of my thinking actually crystallized as I viewed the LRTP and was due to the fine efforts to present the data and information. The graphics in particular are excellent.

In talking about land-use and scenario planning and future growth and what kind of settlement patterns....

I think it's unrealistic to assume that land-use will change in any significant way and the LRTP should not be based on a premise that land-use and settlement patterns will change dramatically from historic patterns.

I think it is also important for us to look back at our growth in terms of how much was based on commuting vs not commuting and how settlement patterns evolved geographically - as related to commuting - i.e. the patterns are dispersed but most are relatively close in to the interstate.

I think the base case for projection should be a continuation of that historical pattern because changing land-use patterns is simply not likely as long as people do have the right to develop their land and as long as Comp Plans designates land-use to accommodate single family subdivisions.

People who move here - to subdivisions - will the advocate for no more subdivisions - to be expected - but not a reasonable expectation.

If the base case assumes continued expansion of commuting into the future as it likely will - then the priorities in the LRTP ought to be oriented towards supporting commuting - more lots, for instance. How many lots do we have for our existing commuters and if they double how many more lots - and where would they need to be.

the imposition of dynamic tolls along with the fact that more untolled lanes will not be added - to me - clearly indicates more commuters - and that would be true no matter whether the growth allocated more centrally or a continuation of the current disbursal patterns.

The most realistic LRTP will assume that we will continue as before but probably with commuting accelerated.

People are still going to move here and commute to the job centers.

I just think it's wishful thinking to premise the LRTP on land-use patterns becoming more centralized and the LRTP has to be careful to not give the impression that it is advocating such a thing.

I think there is a much higher chance of getting localities to recognize the need for commuting facilities than to try to change growth patterns much more than they already have.

There are thousands and thousands of developable land on both sides of I-95 from Stafford to Spotsylvania.

The potential for that land to be developed in the next 20-30 years is pretty high.

The designation of UDAs - in particular the dispersed nodes envisioned in Stafford will lead to extending water/sewer to each of these nodes and all the land outside the nodes along the water/sewer lines will then become prime land for conventional subdivisions.

So I would urge that the base case for the LRTP is to assume land-development that will occur as it has into the future with perhaps some changes but nothing so radical or revolutionary as to head off the need for much infrastructure - other than we more than likely will need far more commuting infrastructure.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry gross
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 6:26 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Re: CHAPTER 4: CONNECTING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

Marti - is there ONE document that I could use to search for things in?

I'm making comments in the order of the chapters but realizing that what I'm commenting on may actually be addressed in a later chapter. Knowing that would save your time and mine sometimes

lcg

On Wed, Feb 6, 2013 at 6:15 PM, Marti Donley <Donley@gwregion.org> wrote:
Thanks Larry

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Gross [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 5:51 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 4: CONNECTING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 4: CONNECTING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

Message Body:

Preface:

Don't take anything I am saying here as unbridled criticism of all the fine efforts that the staff at FAMPO has put into this important document.

Some of my thinking actually crystallized as I viewed the LRTP and was due to the fine efforts to present the data and information. The graphics in particular are excellent.

In talking about land-use and scenario planning and future growth and what kind of settlement patterns....

I think it's unrealistic to assume that land-use will change in any significant way and the LRTP should not be based on a premise that land-use and settlement patterns will change dramatically from historic patterns.

I think it is also important for us to look back at our growth in terms of how much was based on commuting vs not commuting and how settlement patterns evolved geographically - as related to commuting - i.e. the patterns are dispersed but most are relatively close in to the interstate.

I think the base case for projection should be a continuation of that historical pattern because changing land-use patterns is simply not likely as long as people do have the right to develop their land and as long as Comp Plans designates land-use to accommodate single family subdivisions.

People who move here - to subdivisions - will the advocate for no more subdivisions - to be expected - but not a reasonable expectation.

If the base case assumes continued expansion of commuting into the future as it likely will - then the priorities in the LRTP ought to be oriented towards supporting commuting - more lots, for instance. How many lots do we have for our existing commuters and if they double how many more lots - and where would they need to be.

the imposition of dynamic tolls along with the fact that more untolled lanes will not be added - to me - clearly indicates more commuters - and that would be true no matter whether the growth allocated more centrally or a continuation of the current dispersal patterns.

The most realistic LRTP will assume that we will continue as before but probably with commuting accelerated.

People are still going to move here and commute to the job centers.

I just think it's wishful thinking to premise the LRTP on land-use patterns becoming more centralized and the LRTP has to be careful to not give the impression that it is advocating such a thing.

I think there is a much higher chance of getting localities to recognize the need for commuting facilities than to try to change growth patterns much more than they already have.

There are thousands and thousands of developable land on both sides of I-95 from Stafford to Spotsylvania.

The potential for that land to be developed in the next 20-30 years is pretty high.

The designation of UDAs - in particular the dispersed nodes envisioned in Stafford will lead to extending water/sewer to each of these nodes and all the land outside the nodes along the water/sewer lines will then become prime land for conventional subdivisions.

So I would urge that the base case for the LRTP is to assume land-development that will occur as it has into the future with perhaps some changes but nothing so radical or revolutionary as to head off the need for much infrastructure - other than we more than likely will need far more commuting infrastructure.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

--

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 6:44 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 5: THE EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 5: THE EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Message Body:

Existing Transportation system does not allude to the fact that we have a large number of commuters nor does it apparently consider commuter lots and facilities as part of the system.

Would actually think a map of the major commuting roads and commuting facilities could be useful.

re: causes of congestion - 40% are bottlenecks - do we have these identified in our area? Are they prioritized to get improved?

3rd largest system - should explain why that is - that VDOT maintains roads like 600 series and subdivision roads that in other states are the responsibility of the county.

And this means that VDOT has even less money to spend on Primary and Interstate roads.

re: functional classifications

did not see a comparison between the Fed classification and how Va classifies and it might be helpful to people in understanding priorities and funding allocations.

re: " There are plans to implement High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes that will run from the Dulles Tool Road in Northern Virginia via the Capital Beltway (I-495) and connecting to I-395 at Edsall Road, extending down I-95 to the Spotsylvania Interchange Exit #126 (Southern Portion)."

this seems a bit dated and has a typo - Dulles Tool Road....

map might want to show completed section , section under construction and the planned 3rd section.

V/C ratio map seems apart from narrative. Might need a layman's explanation and example and indicate it's role in planning and prioritization.

when listing Primary, secondary etc.. might want to also show their functional classification (understanding it's not a perfect 1-1) necessarily..

Would be also useful to show what percent they are but also the percent of total funding usually allocated.

on bridges, may want to mention they are funded separately, differently...

looks like VRE stuff/map does not include Spotsy and station.

commuter lots - would look good on a map. would you show the planned expansions and new ones?

I think it's important to note that FRED is a region-based system that is not really used for commuting whereas the other is all used for commuting.

I'm bailing on the bike stuff.. someone else can do that.

The two freight tables have the same headers but different data.

Freight and Airport data - nice addition.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:09 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: CHAPTER 6: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS PLAN

From: Larry Gross
Subject: CHAPTER 6: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS PLAN

Message Body:

this para seems a bit awkward and out of place in between Urban and Rural needs:

" The 2040 FAMPO Constrained Highway Plan contains 37 projects which increase roadway capacity, replace/expand aging bridges, enhance safety and operations, improve intersections, increase commuter parking options and provide enhanced accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. It would cost approximately \$10.7 billion to fund all of the projects on the needs plan through 2040, but the region will only receive \$3.3 billion of local, state and federal revenue through 2040, which leads to a \$7.4 million shortfall in funding all of the needs projects."

37 projects that cost what... ??

but instead, it moves to the cost of total needs.

do the 37 cost 3.3 billion ? and the unmet needs 7.4 billion?

urban, rural needs... primary, interstate?

I wish there were a more concise treatment of commuter lot "needs".

One might presume that if we double population that we'd need to double our lots (or more with HOT lanes) and it reads more like an inventory plus listed improvements.

re: " Existing
spaces at the Route 208 park and ride lot would be relocated to this location (VRE).

that's quite a distance out of the way - several miles for folks that are essentially going to backtrack to I-95... that's not going to play well with commuters.

A SUPER Map would be one that showed where future growth would likely allocate itself geographically and the location of existing lots and planned lots.

looks like local transit and NoVa commute needs are in a mash-up... I still would advocate listing them separate... and noting any overlap but there is little overlap I suspect.

we are an exurban community with a high percent of commuters - and a significant and important component of our "needs" is this infrastructure...

we should be focused on this need in our planning.

not clear where VRE is headed. Is it basically close to maxed or is it going to double ridership or what?

end of comments for this section

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross Thursday, February 07,
Sent: 2013 8:53 AM Marti Donley
To: Summary Draft vs Chapter by Chapter
Subject:

From: Larry Gross
Subject: Summary Draft vs Chapter by Chapter

Message Body:

I finally noticed the DRAFT SUMMARY and I would suggest that THIS is the doc that you want the public to start with.

It's much easier to digest and sticks to the key relevant points.

If the Summary had hot links in it that allowed people to move from the Summary to more detailed info in the full doc, that would be a major convenience for people.

For instance, on page 8, if one could click on each of the categories and get moved to that portion of the full doc - it would encourage people to more fully read the Summary knowing that they can drill down deeper on topics of interest if they wanted to.

The time and effort that has gone into this effort is well evident and with the exception of less direct focus on commuting as fundamental to our regions transportation issues - an excellent effort that is much appreciated and I hope it gets 'discovered' by citizens who become more engaged in the process.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 9:13 AM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: references to "Highway Plan" in Draft Summary

From: Larry Gross
Subject: references to "Highway Plan" in Draft Summary

Message Body:

In the Summary - it's not clear (at least to me) what is meant with "Highway Plan".

Is this the actual CLRP or is it the "Needs" Plan?

4 or 5 instances of "highway plan" with about half of them including "Constrained" so perhaps they all mean "constrained" but on page 9 - "needs" it references "highway plan" on bullet 4 but then bullet 5 says 12.4 billion which I thought was the needs plan cost.

I guess it's the switching back and forth in context without sufficient nomenclature to make clear which "plan".

In addition - somewhere early on - might want to consider comparing the two terms CLRP and LRTP - making clear that the "needs" plan is a list of unfunded needs that have no construction date because they have no known funding sources at this point in time.

My feeling is that the public and elected officials will benefit by clearly understanding that the needs will not be built unless more funding is available - at the State and local level.

Right now, many in the public do not think there is a funding problem and that advocacy for increased taxes and tolls is just a money grab for more wasteful spending.

The LRTP has an opportunity to make clear that there is, in fact, a significant funding shortfall relative to identified needs - that no matter HOW we grow - and allocate growth geographically - that number of people is still going to likely have a large percentage of out-region commuters.

I'd actually be more comfortable seeing emphasis on funding needs as opposed to emphasis on changes to land-use to reduce funding needs. To key the localities that when they contemplate more residential housing - no matter whether it is subdivisions or town houses that a nearby commuter lot is a likely need associated with such growth.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry gross
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 9:42 AM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Re: Summary Draft vs Chapter by Chapter

Marti - any idea why the gas tax numbers on page 3 on Chapter 7 are so different between Stafford and Spotsy?

Somehow I though they both got somewhat similar revenues from the 2.1 gas tax.

LarryG

On Thu, Feb 7, 2013 at 9:16 AM, Marti Donley <Donley@gwregion.org> wrote:
Thank you, Larry, for all your comments. I'll be forwarding them on to Lloyd, Andy and Rodney.

Have a great day,
Marti

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Gross [mailto:
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 8:53 AM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Summary Draft vs Chapter by Chapter

From: Larry Gross
Subject: Summary Draft vs Chapter by Chapter

Message Body:

I finally noticed the DRAFT SUMMARY and I would suggest that THIS is the doc that you want the public to start with.

It's much easier to digest and sticks to the key relevant points.

If the Summary had hot links in it that allowed people to move from the Summary to more detailed info in the full doc, that would be a major convenience for people.

For instance, on page 8, if one could click on each of the categories and get moved to that portion of the full doc - it would encourage people to more fully read the Summary knowing that they can drill down deeper on topics of interest if they wanted to.

The time and effort that has gone into this effort is well evident and with the exception of less direct focus on commuting as fundamental to our regions transportation issues - an excellent effort that is much appreciated and I hope it gets 'discovered' by citizens who become more engaged in the process.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

--

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2013 1:04 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: re: congestion, causes, bottlenecks, signal timing

From: Larry Gross
Subject: re: congestion, causes, bottlenecks, signal timing

Message Body:
Chapter 5, Page 60 (and in other places).

we have discussion of congestion, the causes of it to include bottlenecks and signal timing.

But we never really articulate it fully and in depth nor connect it to the priorities and projects.

For one thing, "congestion" is not just one condition. It varies in terms of what kind it is, when it happens and where it happens as well as why it happens.

A road that is LOS F 10 minutes a day is not the same as a road that is LOS D 10 hours a day and yet we make no real distinction when justifying transportation projects.

For instance, many of the projects that are in the "needs" category do not really suffer the same intensity and time period of congestion as other roads.

a minor arterial that sees intense congestion 2 hours a day is not the same as a road that is heavily traveled all hours of the day.

we don't really characterize our road needs in this way.

further, even though you say on page 60 that bottlenecks and signal timing are two significant causes of congestion - we do not have a list of either in terms of characterizing our current network nor targeting them with limited transportation dollars to get more/better bang for the buck.

the signal timing done for Route 3 is a major example of a road that went for years with chronic congestion even outside of rush hour that saw dramatic improvement even though it was never a specific project in the prior LRTP nor identified as a priority in the tip or LRPT.

and we're doing the same thing again with this LRTP.

we need to make an inventory of the bottlenecks and road segments and intersections that have known issues and we need to elevate these kinds of issues higher in the prioritization scheme.

rather than wait for years to widen a badly-functioning road - why not analyze it for signal timing and other bottleneck issues and prioritizing those improvements rather than wait for VDOT to find the resources?

That's something that FAMPO could do as a public outreach to connect better with regions citizens.

Start soliciting a list of areas that citizens think could be improved - put the list on the website and then provide a status for the investigation and potential fixes.

and make that kind of thing a priority in the LRTP process.

If we do not have the money to build all the "needs", how about we see what might be cost-effective fixes for such needs - at least until we find the longer term money?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2013 7:05 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: D-2: Urban Highway Needs Fredericksburg Spotsylvania

From: Larry Gross

Subject: D-2: Urban Highway Needs Fredericksburg Spotsylvania

Message Body:

these appear to be a list of unfunded projects

as a result of almost no available funding there is no YOY and the dollar estimates shown are not identified as to what year they were derived or even if they are actually older out-of-date estimates.

there is also no total dollar estimate shown for all the projects nor any kind of project priorities shown for each individual one.

If some funding DID become available it appears the process of selection would not be a defined one ... but a political one.

these are the kinds of projects that in my view should not appear in a long range transportation plan because they have no funding, no schedule, no priorities... just a list of "needed" roads that are better and more accurately labeled as "NOT FUNDED and no known sources of available funding "

All projects of this type ought to be lumped into one Chapter with a title on the front that says UNFUNDED Projects as labeling them as "needs" actually distorts the total "needs" numbers shown on the summary.

these roads are not truly "needs" in the same "congestion" sense that other roads are categorized. At best many of these roads see some levels of congestion at the height of peak hour and are high functioning at other times.

The Stafford list has the same problems.

Ditto the Fred list.

All 3 are better classified as "nice to have".

None of these 3 constitute on any level - a list of roads that will likely be funded and constructed in the 2040 timeframe unless MUCH more funding is identified.

But even then, because there are no identified priorities and the dollar estimates themselves are suspect these lists are exactly the kind that FHWA advises should not be embedded in a long range transportation plan.

I understand the politics of why they are here but I think by labeling them as "needs" instead of "unfunded" they could mislead the public - especially those who live near them into thinking these projects might be built sometime soon.

We ought to be more honest with citizens as to the actual likely continuing dormant status of these projects - in my opinion.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2013 5:30 PM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Chapter 6 - Regional Needs

From: Larry Gross
Subject: Chapter 6 - Regional Needs

Message Body:
Congestion:

Would be helpful if some level of explanation would be given for congestion, travel time delay, reliability of trip time and level of service

and to include the concept of peak hour periods.

there's a note that says to insert a map showing unimproved level of service in the region.

It would be particularly educational (in my view) if you had several maps.

One would show the status of the area roads - 10, 20, 30 years ago.

then one would show what it is today.

then one would show what it will be like in 2040 - with the constrained projects built.

and finally two maps comparing the congestion/time delay/los levels at peak hour vs non peak hour.

Any all maps of this kind would help to tell the public the story of our regional road system and how it has fared as we have experienced not only growth but a substantial part of that growth - subdivisions - and NoVa commuters.

such maps would help inform the reader as to the more exact nature of the forces that are degraded the regional roads.

It should also be pointed out somewhere that carpools, buses, van pools - REDUCE congestion and buy time and money in road expansions.

It should also be pointed out that there are no known plans to expand the SOV capacity of I-95 and that the future of this area is likely going to be influenced by how many citizens are willing to abandon their SOV commutes and begin using HOV modes of commuting.

We should at least lay this out as one choice to go along with just building more roads or expanding existing ones which the LTRP already advises that we simply will not have the necessary funding to continue to enable/support increased SOV commuting.

To me - that ought to be one of the narratives in the LTRP plan and articulated in the "needs" document.

The obvious question is do we need more commuter lots or more roads?

Can we extend and lengthen the time we can use the existing infrastructure by more HOV commuting?

there does not appear to be a viable alternative at this point.

as expensive as commuter lots are - on a per space cost - that is far less expensive than expanding existing roads many of which are not really expandable unless we intend to buy existing commercially-developed properties.

expanding primary roads like Route 3 and Route 7 is incredibly expensive.

Typically a new location road can be built for 10-20 million per mile if the right-of-way is undeveloped.

compare that to the known costs of adding two lanes to Route 3 for less than 2 miles... 30 million plus dollars.

How many additional park&ride parking places could be provided for 30 million dollars?

Yet the "needs" plan never really explains the process for determining how many additional park & ride spots are need - and where.

sprinkled through the Chapter are various discussions of park & ride included one place where it is stated that 8827 more spaces are needed at a cost of 167 million.

while we use the congestion metric as the proxy for supporting road expansions, what process are we using to determine how many park & ride spots are needed?

It would seem that if we are projected to double our population that it's likely that we will double our commuters and if we combine that with the fact that I-95 SOV capacity will not be expanded - and HOV/HOT is major new additional capacity - it would seem that we need MORE than twice as many spaces s we have now - and that the new spaces should be located where the counties have indicated growth will occur.

VRE - this is a fair amount of discussion about VRE with respect to it's current condition and planned upgrades and the Spotsy station but there is almost no discussion about future VRE capacity or "needs".

a table showing historical VRE ridership from it's inception to now - and then projected ridership through 2040 would help inform people as to VREs role in our anticipated growth.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Larry Gross
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2013 6:55 AM
To: Marti Donley
Subject: Glossary and discussion of road capacity, operational metrics

From: Larry Gross
Subject: Glossary and discussion of road capacity, operational metrics

Message Body:

The Glossary does not include LOS, V/C ratios, Congestion, travel-time delay or other definitions that underlie much of the reasons to justify transportation projects.

There needs to be a preface/forward chapter that informs people how road capacity and operational conditions are measured and how that information goes into determining if improvement is warranted as well as the timeframe and priority.

things like V/C ratio, LOS, and "congestion" are not the same for all roads 24/7 and this is important because a minor arterial that experiences congestion for short periods does not merit equal footing with other roads that are congested more hours of the day.

On the "needs" list - there is no discussion of this and no distinction between projects. Most all of the projects listed on the "needs" lack definitive data that would even justify their inclusion in a list of "needs".

In the prioritization - the kind and type of congestion needs to be more precisely characterized and used to better rank projects.

Many of the secondary minor arterial that appear on the "needs" list are roads to serve subdivision developments - existing and planned.

if these road were removed from the "needs" category, I suspect the "needs" total cost would go down dramatically.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on FAMPO

Marti Donley

From: Lloyd Robinson
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2013 1:54 PM
To: lgross@pobox.com
Cc: Marti Donley; Andy Waple; Rodney White; Daniel Reese
Subject: FW: 2040 LRTP Comments from Larry Gross
Attachments: 2040 LRTP Total Comments from Larry Gross.pdf

Larry,

As always thanks for your detailed attention to the MPO's work. We will work these and other valuable comments into the Final product as we can and discuss them with you and other FAMPO committee members going forward.

Again thanks.

Lloyd

From: Marti Donley
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 9:51 AM
To: Andy Waple; Daniel Reese; Lloyd Robinson; Rodney White
Subject: 2040 LRTP Comments from Larry Gross

Marti Donley

Senior Regional Planner
Public Involvement Coordinator
Title VI Coordinator

George Washington Regional Commission
Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
406 Princess Anne Street
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401
540-373-2890



www.gwregion.org



www.fampo.gwregion.org

Marti Donley

From: JPL [jplynch@crosslink.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 16, 2013 1:04 AM
To: fampo
Subject: 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan

I note that the draft plan includes the Dahlgren Railroad Heritage Trail in King George. This trail is an old transportation corridor in the county. Its good to include it in the plan. The trail when completed will be an alternative transportation resource linking the east and west ends of the county. Regionally it will serve as a non-motorized means for commuters to get to and from the Dahlgren area. Alternatively in the future it could provide a corridor for a light rail system in addition to a bike path.

James P. Lynch
jplynch@crosslink.net

Jim Lynch

Marti Donley

From: RFLarkins@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, March 16, 2013 1:13 PM
To: fampo
Cc: gary.hartwood@live.com
Subject: Input re 2040 Regional Transportation Plan

To the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO):

As a resident of the Celebrate by Del Webb community in southern Stafford County, I appreciate the many benefits to our area that could be realized with the adoption of the "2040 Long Range Transportation Plan." These include modifications to Sanford and Greenbank Roads; the future extension of the HOT lanes to Garrisonville and Spotsylvania; and improvements to the Route 17 interchange with I-95. None of the projects described in the 2040 update, however, will fully accomplish the goal of lessening congestion and improving quality of life along our traffic corridors.

The widening of Route 17 described in the "Plan" will bring some relief, but as a consequence, even more interstate truck and car traffic will be encouraged to use Route 17 to avoid the DC Beltway. Route 17 has been designated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board as a "Multimodal Corridor of Statewide Significance" but the impact of this designation has not been recognized in the 2040 Plan. Per earlier studies, the Fredericksburg area is already coping with a "freight transportation bottleneck." Just recently, in January, there was a period of three days when there were three wrecks on I-95 in Fredericksburg. All involved tractor trailers and the entire region was at a stand-still with other primary and secondary roads clogged with traffic. If there had been an "Outer Beltway," this might have never happened or at least there would have been alternatives to reaching our destinations.

It is my understanding that, previously, in 1995, the solution of an "Outer Connector" was studied in-depth by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) with several routes proposed. These would have begun at the I-95/ Route 627 Centreport interchange in Stafford County. All, however, would have terminated at Route 3 rather than continuing farther and reconnecting with I-95 in the Massaponax or Thornburg area. Partially as the result of concern at public hearings about the impact of traffic on Route 3, local officials withdrew their support for the "Outer Connector" in 2001.

Even though over 15 years have passed since the 1994 study, the Commonwealth Transportation Board, VDOT, FAMPO, and our county and city officials are still very reluctant to consider any form of an "Outer Beltway" for Fredericksburg. This need was not addressed anywhere in the "2040 Plan." I realize the obstacles, e.g. the concern of us all for preserving our historic battlefields and protecting the Rappahannock River Basin, but there must be some alternative or compromise that could be found to mitigate the impact of such an essential highway project on these resources.

Our Virginia governor and state legislature have been able to reach a compromise on transportation funding and it appears there may finally be funds available to move many highway projects forward. A western "Beltway" around Fredericksburg should be at the top of the priority list. It could be similar to those already built around Culpeper, Warrenton and other Virginia cities and run from I-95 in northern Stafford county to I-95 in southern Spotsylvania. It would cross over Routes 17 and 3 with interchanges at each, but connect with I-95 at each end.

While this would be a tremendously expensive highway project, it would benefit all of Virginia and the entire east coast of the United States. Per the "2040 Regional Transportation Plan," the Fredericksburg/George Washington Region is the fastest-growing in Virginia and will remain so in the future. This area faces significant increases in travel demand over the next 27 years. We are already seeing the congestion and reduction in mobility that is forecast and will certainly decrease the attractiveness of this wonderful area to future home owners and businesses.

Our elected officials and the Virginia Department of Transportation should not be ignoring this need just because prior plans and effort were unsuccessful or that it will be many years before a "Beltway" could be completed. We need to begin planning now and this project should be included in the "2040 Long Range Transportation Plan." It is time for them to take the lead and work together to build a coalition that can design and build an "Outer Beltway" for Fredericksburg.

Thank you,

Fran Larkins
40 Battery Point Dr.