

FAMPO Advisory Committee Meeting  
I-95 Corridor Study – Phase 1  
February 29, 2016

**ATTENDANCE: Members:**

Doug Fawcett, City of Fredericksburg; Ed Petrovitch, County of Spotsylvania; Keith Dayton, County of Stafford; CTAG – Alternates, Rupert Farley & Fran Larkins; Chris Arabia, DRPT; Elliott Moore, FHWA; & Annette Adams, VDOT

**ATTENDANCE: Others:** Paul Prideaux, Michael Baker International; Alex Owsaik, Alternate, County of Stafford; Kasey Nabal, Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce ; & Marcie Parker, Allison Richter & Craig Van Dussen, VDOT

**ATTENDANCE: Staff:** Paul Agnello, Nick Quint, Daniel Reese & Lloyd Robinson, FAMPO; & JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

**I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**

Mr. Agnello thanked everyone for attending the second advisory committee meeting for Phase I of the I-95 Corridor Study and introductions were made from all who were in attendance.

**II. REVIEW OF PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE**

Mr. Paul Prideaux with Baker Consultants advised that this is the second Advisory Committee meeting and we are on track and where we planned to be. Mr. Prideaux advised that this is Phase 1 of the I-95 Corridor Study and that if Phase 2 materializes that Phase 2 will come for a multi-modal corridor study.

Mr. Prideaux advised that slides 3-5 of the power point presentation are a review from the first meeting held on February 1<sup>st</sup>. The study area is from Exit 143 at Garrisonville to Exit 126 at Massaponax.

The reason the I-95 Corridor Study was requested is due to the severe and reoccurring traffic congestion that exists today along the I-95 corridor from Quantico to Massaponax. As there is limited transportation funding being allocated to major projects outside of HB2, the results of this study will be released before the second round of HB2 begins. The second round of HB2 scheduling requires that projects be ready by July 2016. Mr. Prideaux stated that this study will allow the committee to determine what I-95 projects should be submitted for consideration in round 2 of the HB2 process.

### **III. EXISTING CONDITIONS – CORRIDOR DEFICIENCIES**

- a.) Average Daily Traffic**
- b.) Truck Percentages**
- c.) Directional Split**
- d.) Congestion Scans**
- e.) Origin/Destination Information**

Mr. Prideaux advised that slide 7 depicts the existing conditions and data utilized is from VDOT's count data from 2014. Mr. Prideaux stated that this template shows the spinal cord of the study. Mr. Prideaux relayed that the counts are existing real counts for the daily a.m. peak periods from Monday through Friday. The directionality percentages are from the regional modeling tool that depicts TDM forecasting. Mr. Prideaux stated that the current version is the data used and this modeling tool has been used nation-wide for decades.

Mr. Prideaux stated that not only were a.m. & p.m. peak times reviewed, but the INRIX data was also used to study the current congestion that occurs on the weekends. Mr. Prideaux advised that the current data is not forecasted data and the data reviewed was from 2 months in the fall of 2015. The existing northbound Saturday congestions were for each Saturday during the 2-month period of time.

The findings of the Saturday northbound congestion showed the following: there were no average travel speeds below 58 mph & there were slight delays that concentrated around the Route 3 & Garrisonville Road areas.

The findings of the Saturday southbound traffic showed that travel speeds averaged less than 45 mph for a 2-hour time period in the middle of the study area. The travel speed averages were less than the posted speed limits for approximately 13 miles of the entire study area. The travel speed averaged less than posted speed limits for over 4-hours within the study area. This data was from Saturday September 14, 2015 to November 19, 2015. Mr. Robinson asked if data could also be run for the summer time frame as this time period would probably show even more delays. Mr. Prideaux advised that his firm has this data and will provide the results as requested.

The findings of the existing Sunday northbound congestion revealed that for over 4.5 hours the average speeds were below 45 mph at the southern end of the study area. The lowest average travel speed dropped to 31 mph. Mr. Prideaux stated that for the entire 17 miles of the study area that average speeds were below the posted speed limits at some point in the sampling data.

The findings of the existing Sunday southbound congestion revealed that there were no average travel speeds of less than 51 mph. However, there were large blocks of time that average speeds were slightly below posted speed limits with the flow of traffic being nose to nose so slowdowns would start to occur. Mr. Prideaux stated that this allowed no ability to add even a percentage of 25% to the traffic without incurring increased traffic congestion.

On the existing weekday northbound a.m. peak congestion travel times, the findings showed that the average travel speed was less than 45 mph for a 3-hour period at the northern end of the study area. The minimum average speed of 26 mph was depicted at the northern end of the study area. The travel speed is less than the posted speed limits for over 13 of the 17 miles of the study area.

The existing weekday southbound p.m. congestion showed that the travel speed averages were less than the 45 mph for a 2.5 hour period for most of the study area. The travel speed averages were less than 45 mph for at least 13 miles of the study area. The travel speed is less than the posted speed limits for over a 4-hour period in the afternoon. Ms. Larkins asked if study data would be available further north of Garrisonville to see if in fact the congestion continues or whether it basically starts at Garrisonville. Mr. Prideaux stated that this area would be out of the approved study area so he was not sure if data already compiled could depict this area. Mr. Prideaux also stated that data was compiled to reflect the existing traffic congestions that are now occurring on both Thursday & Friday southbound for the p.m. congestion periods. The findings showed that the average travel speed was less than 45 mph for a 4-hour period of time for most of the study area. The average travel speeds were less than 35 mph for a 2-hour period for most of the study area. The average travel speed was less than 45 mph for the majority of the study area.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the modeling data showed that in the southbound p.m. destinations that 30% were going to either the Garrisonville or Stafford Courthouse areas; that 20% were going to Route 3; that 17% were going to Rt. 17; & 16% were heading further south of the study area.

Mr. Agnello stated that the 3-hour time frame utilized for the data was from 3:30 – 6:30 p.m. Ms. Larkins referred to slide 16 & stated that she was surprised to see on Route 17 that more traffic was heading east rather than west. Mr. Prideaux stated that they have the data in their possession and he would go back and re-check to ensure this statement is in fact correct.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the southbound p.m. origins showed that at least 50% are crossing the Rappahannock River coming from northbound Prince William County.

#### **IV. PRELIMINARY FUTURE CONDITIONS (2040)**

- a.) No-Build Alternative Assumptions**
- b.) Forecasted Changes (Existing to 2040)**

- a.) Average Daily Traffic**
- b.) Person Throughput**

Mr. Prideaux stated that the future no-build assumption is a hypothetical assessment of the conditions in 2040 which includes the following assumptions:

All existing and committed SYIP projects will be built

Projects included in the Draft HB2 funding plan that includes funding for the southbound Rappahannock River Crossing project and 2 PNR lot projects (1 at Massaponax & 1 at Stafford Courthouse) will materialize

The 2 mile Express Lanes extension in Stafford with an additional general purpose lane on the shoulder southbound to Stafford Courthouse will materialize (this is what was used as the base line for comparison)

Potential interchange safety improvements at Route 3 & I-95 for a 4<sup>th</sup> lane added on I-95

Mr. Dayton asked VDOT for clarification as to what happens if the additional general purpose lane on the shoulder of southbound I-95 does not materialize. Ms. Parker stated that the projects materializing right now are all contingent on how low the project bids come in. Mr. Dayton stated that he felt this committee needs to be developing a back-up plan if bids come in higher than expected.

Mr. Prideaux relayed that even though data will be compiled to predict person throughput, that however, that information is not available for discussion today. Mr. Prideaux stated that these counts are also critical in determining the true traffic congestion needs because as the vehicle is counted as 1 vehicle what needs to be determined is the number of passengers within the said vehicle. Mr. Prideaux stated that the traffic congestion numbers would be even higher without ridesharing opportunities, because all of the riders would be driving personal vehicles.

## **V. DRAFT PURPOSE & NEED STATEMENT**

Mr. Prideaux stated that the purpose of this planning exercise is for the development for an improved program that will address the needs of the I-95 corridor between mpt 145 in Stafford County to mpt 125 in Spotsylvania County for the year 2040.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the needs in the study area include: mitigating recurring congestion problems; promoting better access to job sites; & to maintain compatibility with the local land use plans. Mr. Prideaux advised that all 3 of these are in compliance with HB2 project submission criteria.

## **VI. CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES**

Mr. Prideaux advised that the lists of candidate alternatives (slide 29) are ones that have been submitted to date from VDOT; from Spotsylvania County; & from CTAG. Mr. Agnello stated that we are still missing project alternatives from the City of Fredericksburg and the County of Stafford, and staff has meetings with these 2 localities upcoming over the next 2 weeks. Mr. Prideaux stated that to date, 11 project alternatives for consideration have been submitted and data will be run on each to determine them potentially moving forward. Mr. Prideaux stated that these 11 submitted alternatives are simply just ideas at this point, and his firm has not tested any to date.

Mr. Robinson asked if the current project scope and task order to Baker Consulting would be extended if the following 2 items are requested. 1 – what does the scope say about looking at a new potential outer connector concept; 2 – if the study area went from 13 miles to 15 miles would that exceed the scope task order. Mr. Prideaux stated that he did not know off-hand but it would be his guess right now that these 2 requests could probably be accommodated with little additional work.

Mr. Farley asked VDOT if instituting a toll road for the entire general purpose lanes has been explored. Ms. Parker stated that at this time this has not been considered.

Mr. Prideaux stated that from the 11 proposals submitted to date, plus any additional ones from the other 2 localities, his company will present a total of 6 projects (1 being a no-build option) for consideration.

Mr. Agnello stated that by month-end the 5 build & 1 no-build alternatives should be finalized for review by the committee.

## **VII. NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Prideaux stated that the next steps will be to collect additional or clarified alternatives; the bundling of alternatives already submitted if projects submitted are similar and/or could have additional linkage opportunities for additional projects down the road. Once these are all submitted, the Baker Consulting team will do initial testing on each alternative and report the data obtained.

Mr. Agnello stated that the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting for the Advisory Committee will be held between March 22<sup>nd</sup> & March 31<sup>st</sup> and that he would be sending around a poll for members to reply as to which dates would be the best.

Mr. Agnello stated that if any additional comments are to be made to please forward these to the FAMPO staff by close of business on March 11<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Robinson asked that after the 5 alternatives are decided on could either FAMPO staff and/or Baker provide a visual to go with each alternative – i.e. project description; estimated project cost; time frame for completion; where project will go etc. Mr. Robinson stated that he felt having these visuals to accompany the power point will be helpful when the presentation is made to the Policy Committee. Mr. Agnello stated that he was sure most of these requests could be handled internally by FAMPO staff but if not he and Mr. Prideaux would work together to get these accomplished.

Mr. Agnello stated that he wanted to let the committee also know that the Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring a transportation forum that will be held on March 10<sup>th</sup> at the Fredericksburg County Club beginning at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Agnello encouraged each of the localities and agencies represented to consider sending a staff member to this forum. Mr. Agnello stated that the registration can be done on-line and he thinks the cost to attend is \$25.00 per person.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

