

FAMPO Advisory Committee Meeting  
I-95 Corridor Study – Phase 1  
March 28, 2016

**ATTENDANCE: Members:**

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

**ATTENDANCE: Others:** Paul Prideaux, Michael Baker International; and Jake Herman, Allison Richter, Michelle Shropshire & 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 third advisory committee meeting for Phase I of the I-95 Corridor Study and introductions were made from all who were in attendance.

**II. FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS ON ALTERNATIVES FOR TESTING**

Mr. Paul Prideaux with Baker Consultants advised that this is the third Advisory Committee meeting and that beginning with slide #4, this shows the current candidate list of alternatives that have been presented by the stakeholder committee members. Mr. Prideaux stated that 16 alternatives have been submitted from the following stakeholders: VDOT – 5; City of Fredericksburg – 2; County of Spotsylvania – 3; County of Stafford – 3; & CTAG – 3. Mr. Prideaux stated that his firm will perform modeling analysis on each of the alternatives & provide recommendation to FAMPO staff on a no-build alternative option & 5 additional build options.

**III. CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES MOVING FORWARD**

**a.) Phase 1 versus Phase 2**

Mr. Prideaux advised that on slide #5 of the Power Point presentation, that the recommendations and alternatives provided by the stakeholders shown in the grey areas are alternatives that will not be evaluated, studied, or modeled in Phase 1 of the I-95 Corridor Study; however, they could be alternatives that will be re-evaluated in future study phases.

## **b.) Bundling of Alternatives**

Mr. Prideaux relayed that one of the individual alternatives submitted by a stakeholder was also similar in nature to an alternative submitted by another stakeholder, so they were bundled. Mr. Prideaux also stated that the bundling concept would be studied to determine if a specific alternative could have additional safety and improvement benefits added by extending the alternative scenario a little further than what was recommended on the initial alternatives. Mr. Prideaux stated that any extended alternatives would be evaluated not just on safety improvements but evaluated against the cost involved in extending an alternative.

Mr. Prideaux reviewed the ten alternatives that were included in today's agenda packet and provided some basic re-cap on each alternative and these comments are as follows:

### **Alternative 1 – No-Build Alternative**

Mr. Prideaux stated that even with a no-build option, there are some assumptions: the 95 Express Lanes southern terminus extension project (UPC #108315); the fourth southbound general purpose lane in Segment 2 (UPC# 13558); Exit 140 interchange reconstruction (UPC # 13558); the Courthouse Road widening project (UPC #4632); the I-95 southbound Rappahannock River Crossing project (UPC #101595; & the Route 3 Interchange (Exit 130) HSIP project (UPC #107715).

### **Alternative 2 – Southbound General Purpose Widening**

Mr. Prideaux stated that if built, this project would widen the I-95 general purpose lanes in the southbound direction only. This would involve the construction of a fourth lane southbound from just south of Exit 140 (Courthouse Road) to Exit 133 (US Route 17) and from Exit 130 (Route 3) to Exit 126 (Route 1). The fourth southbound general purpose lane would be designed to work in conjunction with the southbound Rappahannock River Crossing CD lane project (UPC #101595). This project would make use of the full-depth pavement inside shoulder between mileposts 138 & 145 in both the southbound and northbound directions.

### **Alternative 3 – Bi-directional General Purpose Widening**

Mr. Prideaux stated that if built, this project would widen the I-95 general purpose lanes in both directions. This alternative includes the southbound widening described in Alternative 2 as well as a fourth northbound general purpose lane from Exit 126 (Route 1) to the new northbound on-ramp (entrance) to the 95 Express Lanes just south of Exit 143 (Garrisonville Road). This project would utilize the full-depth pavement inside shoulder between mileposts 138 & 145 in both directions.

#### **Alternative 4 – Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing**

Mr. Prideaux advised that if built, this project would construct collector-distributor (CD) lanes in the northbound direction from Exit 130 (Route 3) to Exit 133 (Route 17). These CD lanes would serve as a companion to the southbound CD lanes that are part of the future No-Build Alternative. There would be no new access points assumed as part of this alternative. The specific functional details of this northbound CD lane concept are explained in the IMR. This alternative will include implementation of a directional flyover to serve the Route 3 eastbound to I-95 northbound CD lane movement.

Mr. Agnello stated that per request from the FAMPO Policy Committee, that it is consensus from the members that the northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project not be assumed in the no-build alternative and should compete against other potential I-95 improvements for consideration as top priorities identified by this study effort.

#### **Alternative 5 – New Central Park/Celebrate VA Area Access**

Mr. Prideaux stated that if built, this project would allow a north-facing connection with the Central Park area. The access component of this alternative will only include a southbound off-ramp and a northbound on-ramp but no southbound on-ramp or northbound off-ramp. This alternative includes the northbound Rappahannock River Crossing CD lane project and local road widening as required. Mr. Prideaux stated that where to connect this alternative is still being debated; however, this alternative does not imply that multi-road connectivity is implied.

Mr. Agnello stated that Alternative 5 includes Alternative 4 with the exception of the fly-over ramp from eastbound Route 3 to northbound I-95.

#### **Alternative 6 – New Harrison Road Access**

Mr. Prideaux advised that if built, this project would allow north-facing connections with Harrison Road. It would include a southbound off-ramp and a northbound on-ramp but no southbound on-ramp or northbound off-ramp. This alternative would require CD lanes in both directions between Exit 130 (Route 3) and the new access point at Harrison Road. The CD lanes would not extend south of Harrison Road, but the southbound I-95 deceleration lane to Exit 126 would be lengthened. In Alternative 6, all elements of Alternative 4 would also be included. This also includes the widening of Harrison Road to four lanes to the east and possibly more than four lanes to the west.

Mr. Robinson advised that in FAMPO's 2040 CLRP, Harrison Road is noted as being widened to four lanes. Mr. Agnello stated that this alternative would require that the Harrison Road bridge be improved and widened to accommodate the additional traffic that would be using the interchange.

### **Alternative 7 – New Courthouse Road Access**

Mr. Prideaux stated that if built, this would allow a north-facing connection with Courthouse Road. It would include a southbound off-ramp and a northbound on-ramp but no southbound on-ramp or northbound off-ramp. Alternative 7 also would require CD lanes in both directions between Exit 130 (Route 3) and the new access point at Courthouse Road. The CD lanes would not extend south of Courthouse Road, but the southbound I-95 deceleration lane to Exit 126 would be lengthened. All elements included in Alternative 4 would also be included in Alternative 7. No new widening of Courthouse Road is being assumed in Alternative 7.

### **Alternative 8 – Super Ramp at US 1/US 17**

Mr. Prideaux stated that Alternative 8 is functionally different from the previous alternatives discussed. Mr. Prideaux stated that all changes at the southern end include both northbound and southbound CD lanes from Route 17 to Route 1; however, they do not connect to I-95. Mr. Prideaux stated that construction of a Super Ramp is described at Exit 126 in the locality's planning study. This concept would connect the southbound I-95 off-ramp at Exit 126 with Route 17 eastbound by way of CD lanes. The northbound CD lanes would terminate just north of Exit 126.

### **Alternative 9 – Extension of the 95 Express Lanes to Route 3**

Mr. Prideaux advised that if built, this alternative would result in an extension of the reversible express lanes from south of Exit 143 (Garrisonville Road) to south of Exit 130 (Route 3). This alternative would include a north-facing direct connection from Route 610 eastbound to the 95 Express Lanes.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the reversible express lane extension would not exist for the full length of Segment 7; the terminus would be approximately 3,000ft south of Route 3.

### **Alternative 10 – Extension of the 95 Express Lanes to Route 1**

Mr. Prideaux stated that Alternative 10 is a cousin to Alternative 9, and if built, it would provide a reversible express lane extension to Route 1. This project would begin at the existing extension of the reversible express lanes south of Exit 143 (Garrisonville Road) and go south to Exit 126 (Route 1). This alternative would also include a north-facing and direct connection from Route 610 eastbound to the 95 Express Lanes. Mr. Prideaux stated that Alternative 10 is the same as Alternative 9; however, Alternative 10 would go further south. Mr. Prideaux relayed that at this time, any specific express lane access assumptions would still need to be determined.

## **IV. EARLY RESULTS OF ALTERNATIVE TESTING**

Mr. Prideaux stated that the study team has had an opportunity to conduct some preliminary modeling of Alternatives 6 & 7 to be able to better understand the implications of new access points needed at these locations. The information presented today is simply information from a

demand-based view of the alternatives. Mr. Prideaux stated that other factors which would influence decisions on any alternatives include cost, permitability, impacts, and local support. Mr. Prideaux advised that the study team will not only provide data for each of the alternatives but will include cost estimates, etc.

**a.) Harrison Road Access**

**a.) 2040 Peak Period Volume Impacts**

Mr. Prideaux stated that data is being compiled with the assumption that a full interchange at Harrison Road could be built. Mr. Prideaux stated that the a.m. peak hours in connection with the 2040 ramp volumes have been tested. The preliminary results indicate that this new interchange would provide for larger demands and usage heading northbound.

Mr. Prideaux stated that preliminary modeling has shown that a full interchange at Harrison Road would result in a 14% decrease in peak period travel volume for traffic entering I-95 northbound from Route 3 and a 25% drop at Exit 126. For the p.m. peak period, the preliminary data shows that there would be minimal impact to Route 3. Mr. Prideaux stated that the preliminary data depicts that there would be a 16% drop in peak traffic volumes for traffic exiting at Route 3. Mr. Prideaux stated that the volume was surprisingly high heading northbound in the p.m. peak travel periods. There was also a 35% drop in the peak period traffic volume exiting at exit 126.

**b.) Courthouse Road Access**

**b.) 2040 Peak Period Volume Impacts**

Mr. Prideaux advised that data is being compiled with the assumption that a full interchange at Courthouse Road could be built. Mr. Prideaux stated that preliminary data has shown that if a new access point at Courthouse Road was built that it would result in a 7% drop in volume entering I-95 from exit 130. Mr. Prideaux stated that a 19% drop in peak volume entering I-95 from exit 126 would also occur as a result of the Courthouse Road access points.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the preliminary data shows a 6% drop in the p.m. peak period volumes exiting at exit 130 as a result of a Courthouse Road access being built. There was still a surprisingly high northbound volume in the p.m. peak time periods. A 50% drop in the p.m. peak traffic volume exiting at exit 126 would occur as a result of the Courthouse Road access being built.

Mr. Prideaux relayed that high-level take-aways from the preliminary demand analysis for potential new access points at both Harrison Road and Courthouse Road showed the following:

- 1.) there is significant demand for additional I-95 access in the study corridor;
- 2.) the demand at the new access points would not be a one-for-one exchange for demands at existing adjacent interchanges;
- 3.) on average, the north-facing ramps are forecasted to have 2.5 to 3 times the demand of south-facing ramps; and
- 4.) on an absolute and percentage basis, both of the potential new access points (Harrison Road & Courthouse Road) drew more demand from Exit 126 (Route 1) than from Exit 130 (Route 3).

Mr. Farley stated that he would like to see I-95 congestion pricing or tolling be included as one of the five study alternatives. There was committee discussion regarding this alternative; however, Mr. Farley's request was not supported by the committee.

## **V. SCHEDULE AND NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Prideaux stated that the next steps will be the following:

- By April 4<sup>th</sup> – feedback from committee members so the alternatives for modeling will be finalized.
- Month of April – modeling and testing of alternatives.
- Early May – presentation of the draft modeling results.
- Late May – refinement/identification of the preferred alternatives.
- June – the final report and documentation will be provided to FAMPO.

Mr. Agnello stated that an email would be sent out to members for the purpose of scheduling the 4<sup>th</sup> Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Agnello relayed that the next meeting will be scheduled between April 20<sup>th</sup> and April 29<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Agnello advised that information will be forwarded to committee members after the conclusion of today's meeting so that the date that best fits the majority's schedules will be finalized. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

